

**Instructional Assessment
Sub-committee**

March 2, 2007

1:30 pm – 3:00 pm; Library 112

AGENDA

1. Approval of Discussion Notes from February 2, 2007 meeting – Dr. Paul Matney
2. Update of Training for Disciplines with Primary Focus of a Major – Danita McAnally
 - Discuss results of the sessions
 - Next step?
3. Report from each General Education Competency Committee Leader
 - Discuss rubric process
 - Strengths/challenges of committees
4. Reports on Progress of each General Education Competency Assessment – Kara Larkan-Skinner
 - Assignment submissions/faculty participating
 - Number of 30 credit hr. students by competency
 - Divisional breakdown
 - Discuss changes that need to be made
5. Discussion of Current Events Relevant to Accountability (including Outcomes Assessments)
6. Next Meeting – Friday, April ??, 2007 – Dr. Paul Matney

**Instructional Assessment
Sub-Committee
NOTES**

March 2, 2007

Attending: Joe Gandy, Kara Larkan-Skinner, Danita McAnally, Ann Hamblin, Dan Ferguson, Jim Powell, Paul, Matney, Damaris Schlong

Absent: Delton Moore, Mark Rowh, Susan Burgoon, Sheryl Mueller, Wendy Poling, Mark Usnick, Jill Gibson

Guest: Aimee Martin substituting for Wendy Poling

Approval of Discussion Notes from February 2, 2007 – Dr. Paul Matney

A motion was made by Jim Powell to approve the discussion notes and seconded by Joe Gandy. Motion carried.

Update of Training for Disciplines with Primary Focus of a Major – Danita McAnally

- **Discuss results of sessions**

Kara reported the Outcome Assessment Training handout reflects the poor attendance in the divisions of Language, Communication and Fine Arts and Sciences and Engineering. Kara noted that they would reschedule training for the two areas. Danita said we hate to move on when these areas have not received their instructions. She indicated that it will take two years to really refine the instructions. All areas are asked to include at least one direct outcome. Kara noted perceptions of the committees were they are beginning to understand their direction. Danita noted we need to get the training finished this month so we can move on. Paul said we are making progress.

- **Next Step?**

Kara noted comments and concerns need to be addressed. Please ask your division to be patient and we will get back with them.

Report from each General Education Competency Committee Leader.

Joe Gandy, Mathematical Competency Leader reported that the math skills are not across the board. He noted they are going to have to grade assignments before they are submitted. His recommendation is that the faculty member grade the sample tests and before submitting the student work for the mathematics competency samples. Kara will then select one or two questions for the committee to assess. Joe noted two people on the assessment group would have to be math people and that the entire group must assess each sample. Danita agreed that both the math and ethics competency committees should have a minimum of two discipline experts on these committees.

Dan Ferguson Communication Competency Leader noted Glen Anderson with Texas Tech Pharmacy School asked our English department to assess their student essays. The rubric of the communications competency committee is being used to assess these essays and found to be effective. The committee asked whether results of this group could serve as an external benchmark. Dan will inquire about this possibility.

Jim Powell reported on Ethics and Diversity, they found they cannot assess multiple choice on tests. This committee also found that their rubric worked well. They feel the basic rubric is sound, but it may take a little adjustment.

The Application of Critical Thinking, Technological (Computer) Literacy, and Aesthetic Awareness competency committees did not have representation at this meeting and thus did not give reports.

Reports of Progress of each General Education Competency Assessment – Kara Larkan-Skinner.

Paul noted we need to brag on the faculty who stepped up and submitted assignments. This is incredible increase considering what we had last meeting. Danita reported we will assess dual credit students when assessing outcomes in the disciplines but will not assess dual credit for general education. The reason dual credit will not be assessed in the general education competencies is that the committee has established 30 credit hours and dual credit students rarely have completed 30 hours.

- **Assignment submissions/faculty participating**

- **Number of 30 credit hr. students by competency**

The bar chart represents the estimated students that have been submitted for assessment. The pie chart represents the 30 credit hour students and the division which they represent. One division, Industrial and Transportation Technologies did not make any submissions

- **Discuss changes that need to be made**

Kara said she had planned to not ask for specific students' work to avoid even an appearance of bias. Instead, Kara is asking for the work of every student in the class. In rare instances such as when the instructor must download the students work, Kara is identifying to the instructor which students meet the 30 hours requirement and only requesting the work of those students. Kara said that we need to stress that anonymity of students and faculty is one of our goals. Aimee Martin suggested that Paul announce this at the faculty meeting in August. The message is "this is our overall report." Dan said any approach will work as long as an instructor cannot select the students they want to include. Kara will now request that some faculty send only specific students but this will be done on a case by case basis.

Discussion of Current Events Relevant to Accountability (including Outcomes Assessments)

Danita requested this topic be added because of all the information that is out there. The Governor has a higher education proposal about giving more money to higher education. Higher education especially community colleges are receiving comments that they rank higher than all other higher education institutions when it comes to additional funding. Accountability has been stated as a requirement for any extra funding. The Legislature plans to eliminate TAKS which happens in the middle of the year. It will have to be replaced by something else because each state must have accountability according to the federal mandate of No Child Left Behind. The replacement for TAKS is expected to be end-of-course exams.

Previously, colleges and universities did not have to have an increase in graduates to get more funds but this is a current proposal. Baccalaureate programs will be awarded additional funds per graduate but these graduates must pass a field of study test. What is the incentive for a student to take the test? They cannot graduate if they have not taken the test. Community colleges will be paid extra if the students graduate, no test has been proposed for community college students. Currently, these are all just proposals. All higher education is going to have to have some level of accountability.

Next Meeting – Friday April 6, 2007 – Dr. Paul Matney 1:30 Lib 113

Adjourned – 2:45 p.m.